

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/768,595	01/30/2004	Yaling Fan	STL11288.00	7053
75	90 08/29/2006	EXAMINER		
Fellers Snider Blankenship Bailey & Tippens			MERCEDES, DISMERY E	
Bank One Towe	er ·			
100 North Broadway			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Suite 1700			2627	
Oklahoma CIty, OK 73102-0621			DATE MAILED: 08/20/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/768,595	FAN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dismery E. Mercedes	2627
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 J 2a) □ This action is FINAL. 2b) ⊠ This 3) □ Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under B	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4)	wn from consideration. rejected. d to. or election requirement. er.	to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicationity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/768,595 Page 2

Art Unit: 2627

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,10,20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1,6-7,10-12,14,18,20-21,23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balster et al. (US 5,818,658), in view of Ou-Yang et al. (US 6,728,062).

As to Claim 1, Balster et al. discloses a cantilevered assembly comprising a transducer (as depicted in Fig.1); and a flow control device to provide blowing or suction (col.2, lines 51-67).

Balster et al. fails to specifically disclose that the blowing or suction is provided to a selected one of an upstream leading edge or a downstream trailing edge. However, Ou-Yang et al. discloses such (abstract and col.4, line 55 – col.5, line 64, wherein the airflow is being provided to the desired direction, leading or trailing area of the assembly). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the device as disclosed by Balster et al. with the teachings of Ou-Yang et al. the motivation being to reduce the resonances on the assembly due to airflow and to reduce disk flutter induced track misregistration (col. 2, lines 64-67 of Ou-Yang et al.).

As to Claim 3, Balster et al. further discloses a plurality of cantilevered assemblies coupled to an actuator having a stack height and wherein the flow control device comprises a nozzle having an elongated outlet having a dimension substantially corresponding to the stack height (figs. 1-2 and disclosure thereof and col. 2, lines 54-56).

As to claim 6, Balster et al. further discloses wherein the transducer comprises one of a servo head, a write head, a read head or a read/writer head (see fig. 2, "14" and disclosure thereof and col. 1, lines 15-18).

As to Claim 7, Balster et al. further discloses a flow sensor coupled to a controller operably coupled to the flow control device to provide flow feedback to control operation of the flow control device (col. 3, lines 1-25).

As to Claims 10 is an apparatus claim drawn to the method of claim 1, therefore is rejected for similar reasons as set forth in the rejection of claim 1 above.

As to Claim 11, Balster further discloses that the flow control device includes a blower nozzle coupleable to a pressure source or blower to supply pressure (figs. 1-2 and disclosure thereof and col. 2, lines 51-67).

As to Claim 12, Balster further discloses a vacuum assembly to provide a vacuum proximate to the flow field (col. 3, lines 1-15).

As to Claim 14, Ou-Yang et al. further discloses wherein the medium is characterized as a storage disc supported by a spindle hub (see fig.1).

As to Claim 18, Balster further discloses a flow sensor to provide flow feedback for the flow control device (col.3, lines 17-20).

As to claim 23, Balster further discloses adjusting pressure parameters of the blower assembly or the vacuum assembly based upon feedback from a flow sensor (col. 3, lines 1-19).

As to Claims 20-21,24 have limitations similar to those treated in the above rejections of claims 1,3,6-7,11, and are met by the references as discussed above.

3. Claims 17,25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balster et al. in view of Ou-Yang et al. further in view of Ahn (US 259,576).

AS to claim 17, the combination of Balster et al. and Ou-Yang et al. discloses the apparatus as claimed in claim 10, but failed to particularly disclose wherein the apparatus is characterized as a servo writer configured to write servo data to the storage medium. However, Ahn discloses such (Figs.1-2,, 4 and abstract). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the apparatus as disclosed by Balster and Ou-Yang et al. with the teachings as disclosed by Ahn, the motivation being to provide such apparatus with the capability of writing servo patterns with improved precision control.

As to Claim 25, has limitation similar to those treated in the above rejection of claim 17, and are met by the references as discussed above.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 2,4-5, 15-16,19,22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Shimizu et al. (US 6,369,978); Schirle (US 5,898,545); Chang et al. (US 2002/0075591); Tadepalli et al. (US 6,710,977).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dismery E. Mercedes whose telephone number is 571-272-7558. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, from 9:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wayne R. Young can be reached on 571-272-7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

WAYNE YOUNG